



Robert W. Quinn, Jr.  
Federal Government Affairs  
Vice President

Suite 1000  
1120 20th Street NW  
Washington DC 20036  
202 457 3851  
FAX 202 457 2545

December 20, 2002

Via Electronic Filing

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW, Room TWB-204  
Washington, DC 20554

Re: In the Matter of Review of Regulatory Requirements for Incumbent LEC Broadband Telecommunications Services; In the Matter of SBC Petition for Expedited Ruling That It Is Non-Dominant In Its Provision of Advanced Services and For Forbearance From Dominant Carrier Regulation for Those Services, CC Docket Nos. 01-337

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On Thursday December 19, I had two telephone conversations with Dan Gonzalez, Commissioner Kevin Martin's Legal Advisor. We discussed issues raised in the aforementioned proceeding. Specifically, we stated that SBC has not provided a record sufficient for this Commission to determine that it lacks relevant market power – the fundamental showing required in any reasoned non-dominance determination – with respect to any of the services it seeks to have reclassified. While SBC has conceded that the relevant markets are local (because a residential or business consumer in a particular locality can only turn to the broadband providers that serve that locality) and that competitive activity varies widely from one locality to the next, SBC has not provided competition data for a *single* local market for *any* service. Indeed, in many localities, SBC either faces *no* meaningful competition or controls bottleneck input facilities, *i.e.*, marketplace conditions that the Commission and the courts have consistently held plainly *do* create market power and demand dominant carrier classification.

I also explained that where SBC provides services to small businesses – SBC's DSL services may compete with its own T1, ISDN, and other high margin dedicated business services, but rarely face any competition from cable facilities that do not even *serve* business districts. In many cases, SBC's competition for residential broadband Internet services where cable is active are also limited. As the California PUC has stressed, for example, "forty-five percent of Californians that live in cities with broadband service have DSL service as their *only* broadband option." I also pointed out that where cable and DSL do compete head-to-head, there usually exists only duopoly conditions that the Commission held in the *DirecTV-Echostar* proceeding cannot be relied upon to constrain market power. Given the record presented, I articulated that Commission cannot make a non-dominance finding and therefore should deny SBC's in its entirety. If the Commission were determined to make some relief available despite the lack of record evidence supporting SBC's request, it should limit that relief to removal of tariff and cost support obligations for retail DSL services sold by a separate affiliate in areas where there is a facilities

based cable competitor on the grounds that in those situations, the Commission may assume that the cost of that form of regulation are outweighed by the benefits, although even there, SBC has not made the requisite showing. We also requested that the commission make explicit that special access services are not part of any relief granted as set forth in the NPRM in this proceeding and that all of the tariffing and cost support obligations currently imposed on the incumbent LEC for services provided to the separate affiliate remain in place.

My comments were consistent with the views expressed in ex partes filed by AT&T on December 18, 2002 and December 19, 2002 as well as the Comments, Reply Comments and other ex partes previously filed in this proceeding. Consistent with Commission rules, I am filing one electronic copy of this notice and request that you place it in the record of the above-referenced proceedings.

Sincerely,

*Robert W. Quinn Jr.*

cc: Dan Gonzales